

USSN 08/659,952
COLB-001/09US

Ei

(i) idle and ringing states.

REMARKS

Although these amendments are made after discussions with Examiner Chen and to expedite allowance, the following general observations about the prior art may be helpful:

In Examiner Chen's October 27, 1998 Final Office Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruo in view of Hayden.

In making this rejection, the Examiner indicates that "Hayden discloses a call handle (call appearance, Col.5, Lines 13-47) to define each call connection between an AV device and its associated port, each call handle defining...."

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hayden call appearance defines the status of all participants in a call, not the connection between a device and a port.

Furthermore, the "call appearance" of Hayden is not the same as the claimed call handle. Hayden's call appearance is, in fact, nothing more than a graphical representation of a single global centralized call state, representing the entire call. In contrast, the claimed call handle mechanism provides a decomposed, decentralized call state for independent manipulation and management of separate parts of a call. In independent claims 15 and 22 it is clear that an independent and separate call handle is created for each AV device in a teleconference call. The advantage of this is that one "portion" of a call can be separately "manipulated" independently of the other "portion" of the call.

USSN 08/659,952
COLB-001/09US

As to the rejection of independent claims 21 and 28 (along similar lines as dependent claim 19 and based on Hayden plus Bales plus others), Applicants comment as follows. As clearly stated in, Hayden *does not allow, much less teach or imply*, the functionality of independent claims 21 and 28. Specifically, Hayden indicates that "the actions which *cannot be controlled* by the user are: ... a remote party drops and a remote party adds."¹ (our emphasis) Not only does this relate to the obviousness of combining Mauro, Hayden, Palmer and Bales, but it also indicates the substantial difference between the call appearance approach of Hayden and the claim call handle mechanism. Further, independent claims 21 and 28 are limited to reflect that *any* one of a plurality of users can remotely disconnect or put on hold any one of a number of users. It is submitted that this claimed configuration is neither disclosed in nor obvious from the cited references. As indicated above, Hayden specifically states that it cannot do this. Also, Bales does not disclose the claim limitation where *any one of the users* can disconnect or place on hold another user. Indeed, Bales specifically states that only the "station controlling an individual conference can terminate any [other] station..." and goes on to declare "A station set which is a sub-party to a conference can *only* terminate itself from the conference and is *incapable* of terminating another station set." [Column 7, lines 58 to 63, emphasis added]. This is not surprising when the Bales architecture is considered. Bales uses an architecture based on one station controlling a call. [Column 7, lines 26 to 39, describing Figs 8 and 9] Thus, Bales is a hierarchical configuration.

In stark contrast, the invention claimed in these specific claims is based on an architecture where all "stations" are equal peers with equal functionality.

USSN 08/659,952
COLB-001/09US

In any event, it is not proper to combine Hayden (that expressly says a feature cannot be done) with Bales to obtain the claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, therefore, the claims are believed patentable. Accordingly, Applicants request entry of this amendment allowance of this application. For the examiner's convenience, a clean copy of the claims are attached.

Respectfully submitted,



CRAIG P. OPPERMAN
Reg. No. 37,078

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Telephone: (650) 843-5115
Facsimile: (650) 857-0663

¹ column 5, lines 53 to 55